arXiv:hep-ph/9709397v2 21 Sep 1997

Renormalizations in Softly Broken SUSY Gauge Theories

L.V. Avdeev[1], **D.I. Kazakov**[2] and **I.N. Kondrashuk**[3]

Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research,
141 980 Dubna, Moscow Region, RUSSIA

Abstract

The supergraph technique for calculations in supersymmetric gauge theories where supersymmetry is broken in a "soft" way (without introducing quadratic divergencies) is reviewed. By introducing an external spurion field the set of Feynman rules is formulated and explicit connections between the UV counterterms of a softly broken and rigid SUSY theories are found. It is shown that the renormalization constants of softly broken SUSY gauge theory also become external superfields depending on the spurion field. Their explicit form repeats that of the constants of a rigid theory with the redefinition of the couplings. The method allows us to reproduce all known results on the renormalization of soft couplings and masses in a softly broken theory. As an example the renormalization group functions for soft couplings and masses in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model up to the three-loop level are calculated.

PACS numbers: 11.10Gh, 11.10Hi,11.30Pb

---

[1] E-mail: avdeevL@thsun1.jinr.dubna.su
[2] E-mail: kazakovd@thsun1.jinr.dubna.su
[3] E-mail: ikond@thsun1.jinr.dubna.su

1 Introduction

Supersymmetry, if it exists, must be broken. The gauge theory with softly broken supersymmetry has been widely studied. To break supersymmetry without destroying the renormalization properties of SUSY theories, in particular the non-renormalization theorems and the cancellation of quadratic divergencies, one has to introduce the so-called soft terms [1]. They include the bilinear and trilinear scalar couplings and the mass terms for scalars and gauginos.

A powerful method for studying SUSY theories which keeps supersymmetry manifest is the supergraph technique [2, 3]. It is also applicable to softly broken SUSY models by using the "spurion" external superfields [1, 4, 5]. As has been shown by Yamada [6] with the help of the spurion method the calculation of the β functions of soft SUSY-breaking terms is a much simpler task than in the component approach. Using the spurion technique he has derived very efficient rules which allow him to calculate the soft term divergencies starting from those of a rigid theory in low orders of perturbation theory.

However, these rules need some modification since, as mentioned by Yamada [6], there might appear some problems in the calculation of vector vertices because they contain chiral derivatives acting on external lines.

In the present paper we develop such a modification of the spurion technique in gauge theories which takes care of the above mentioned problem. We formulate the Feynman rules and show that the ultraviolet divergent parts of the Green functions of a softly broken SUSY gauge theory possess the factorization property being proportional to those of a rigid theory.

In general, we consider a softly broken supersymmetric gauge theory as a rigid SUSY theory imbedded into the external space-time independent superfield, so that all the parameters as the couplings and masses become external superfields. This approach to a softly broken sypersymmetric theory allows us to use remarkable mathematical properties of $N = 1$ SUSY theories such as non-renormalization theorems, etc. We show that the renormalization procedure in a softly broken SUSY gauge theory can be performed in exactly the same way as in a rigid theory with the renormalization constants being external superfields. They are related to the corresponding renormalization constants of a rigid theory by the coupling constants redefinition. This allows us to find explicit relations between the renormalizations of soft and rigid couplings.

Throughout the paper we assume the existence of some gauge and SUSY invariant regularization. Though it is some problem by itself, we do not consider it here. Provided the rigid theory is well defined, we consider the modifications which appear due to the presence of soft SUSY breaking terms. To be more precise, in the following sections when discussing one, two and three loop calculations of the renormalization constants we have in mind dimensional reduction and the minimal subtraction scheme. Though dimensional reduction is not self-consistent in general, it is safe to use it in low orders and all the actual calculations are performed in the framework of dimensional reduction [7, 8, 9, 10]. Nevertheless, our main formulae have general validity provided the invariant procedure exists.

2 Softly Broken Pure $N = 1$ SUSY Yang–Mills Theory

Let us first consider pure $N = 1$ SUSY Yang-Mills theory with a simple gauge group. The Lagrangian of a rigid theory is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{rigid} \;=\; \int d^2\theta \, \frac{1}{4g^2}\mathrm{Tr} W^\alpha W_\alpha + \int d^2\bar\theta \, \frac{1}{4g^2}\mathrm{Tr}\bar W^\alpha \bar W_\alpha . \qquad (1)$$

Here W^α is the field strength chiral superfield defined by

$$W^\alpha = \overline{D}^2 \left(e^{-V} D^\alpha e^V \right),$$

where $V^a_b = V^A \left(T^A\right)^a_b$ and T^A are the generators of the gauge group G.

To perform a soft SUSY breaking, one can introduce a gaugino mass term. This is the only term allowed in a pure gauge theory which does not break a gauge invariance. The soft SUSY breaking term is

$$-\mathcal{L}_{soft-breaking} = \frac{m_A}{2}\lambda\lambda + \frac{m_A}{2}\bar\lambda\bar\lambda,$$

where λ is the gaugino field. To rewrite it in terms of superfields, let us introduce an external spurion superfield $\eta = \theta^2$, where θ is a grassmannian parameter. The softly broken Lagrangian can now be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{soft} \;=\; \int d^2\theta \, \frac{1}{4g^2}(1 - 2\mu\theta^2)\mathrm{Tr} W^\alpha W_\alpha + \int d^2\bar\theta \, \frac{1}{4g^2}(1 - 2\bar\mu\bar\theta^2)\mathrm{Tr}\bar W^\alpha \bar W_\alpha . \qquad (2)$$

In terms of component fields the interaction with external spurion superfield leads to a gaugino mass equal to $m_A = \mu$, while the gauge field remains massless. This external chiral superfield can be considered as a vacuum expectation value of a dilaton superfield emerging from supergravity, however, this is not relevant to further consideration.

2.1 The Feynman rules

Consider now the Feynman rules corresponding to the Lagrangian (2). For this purpose it is useful to rewrite the integral over the chiral superspace in (2) in terms of an integral over the whole superspace. One has

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{soft} \;=\; & \int d^2\theta d^2\bar\theta \left(\frac{1}{4g^2}(1 - 2\mu\theta^2)\mathrm{Tr} e^{-V} D^\alpha e^V \bar D^2 e^{-V} D_\alpha e^V \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{4g^2}(1 - 2\bar\mu\bar\theta^2)\mathrm{Tr} e^{-V} \bar D^\alpha e^V D^2 e^{-V} \bar D_\alpha e^V \right). \qquad (3)\end{aligned}$$

Consider the quadratic part of the action

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)} \;=\; & \int d^4x d^2\theta \; d^2\bar\theta \mathrm{Tr} \, \frac{1}{4g^2} \left(1 - 2\mu\theta^2\right) D^\alpha V(x,\theta,\bar\theta) \bar D^2 D_\alpha V(x,\theta,\bar\theta) \\ + \; & \int d^4x d^2\theta \; d^2\bar\theta \mathrm{Tr} \, \frac{1}{4g^2} \left(1 - 2\mu\bar\theta^2\right) \bar D^{\dot\alpha} V(x,\theta,\bar\theta) D^2 D_{\dot\alpha} V(x,\theta,\bar\theta). \end{aligned}$$

To find the propagator, one first has to fix the gauge. In a rigid theory the gauge fixing condition is usually taken as

$$\bar{D}^2 V = f, \quad D^2 V = \bar{f}. \tag{4}$$

This is equivalent to adding to the action (1) a gauge-noninvariant term proportional to

$$\mathcal{L}_{gauge-fixing} = \mathrm{Tr}\ \frac{1}{\alpha}\bar{f}f = \mathrm{Tr}\ \frac{1}{2\alpha}\left(\bar{f}f + f\bar{f}\right). \tag{5}$$

By joining this together the quadratic part of the rigid action takes the form

$$S^{(2)}_{rigid} = \int d^2\theta\ d^2\bar{\theta}\left[\frac{1}{4g^2}\mathrm{Tr}D^\alpha V\bar{D}^2 D_\alpha V + \frac{1}{4g^2}\mathrm{Tr}\bar{D}^\alpha V D^2\bar{D}_\alpha V - \frac{1}{2\alpha}D^2 V\bar{D}^2 V\right].$$

It can also be rewritten as

$$\frac{4}{g^2}\int d^2\theta\ d^2\bar{\theta}\mathrm{Tr}V\left[\Pi_{1/2} + \frac{1}{\alpha}\Pi_0\right]\partial^2 V,$$

where we have introduced the projectors [11]

$$\Pi_{1/2} = -\frac{D^\alpha\bar{D}^2 D_\alpha}{8\partial^2}, \quad \Pi_0 = \frac{D^2\bar{D}^2 + \bar{D}^2 D^2}{16\partial^2},$$

The inverse operator then gives the vector propagator

$$\left\langle V^a(z_1)V^b(z_2)\right\rangle_{rigid} = \frac{g^2}{4}\frac{\Pi_{1/2} + \alpha\Pi_0}{\partial^2}\delta^{(8)}(z_1 - z_2)\delta^{ab},$$

The next task related to the determination of the vector propagator is to find the associated ghost term. Under the gauge transformation the superfield V is transformed as

$$e^V \rightarrow e^{-i\Lambda^\dagger}e^V e^{i\Lambda},$$

or in the infinitesimal form

$$\begin{aligned} & V \rightarrow V + H(V)\Lambda + \bar{H}(V)\bar{\Lambda} \\ & = V + \left(-\frac{V}{2}\right)\bigwedge\left[\left(\Lambda + \overline{\Lambda}\right) + \coth\left(\frac{V}{2}\right)\bigwedge\left(\Lambda - \overline{\Lambda}\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the associated ghost term is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{ghost} &= \int d^2\theta\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \frac{1}{g^2}b\bar{D}^2\left(H(V)c + \bar{H}(V)\bar{c}\right) + \int d^2\bar{\theta}\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \frac{1}{g^2}\bar{b}D^2\left(H(V)c + \bar{H}(V)\bar{c}\right) \\ &= \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \frac{1}{g^2}\left(b + \bar{b}\right)\left(-\frac{V}{2}\right)\bigwedge\left[(c + \bar{c}) + \coth\left(\frac{V}{2}\right)\bigwedge(c - \bar{c})\right], \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where b and c are the Faddeev–Popov ghost chiral superfields.

For a system in the external spurion field we can change the gauge fixing condition (4) in order to take into account the interaction of the associated ghost fields with the spurion. The reason for this is the appearance of these terms in due course of renormalization. Here, we depart from the Feynman rules of ref.[6]. Our aim is also to get the same common spurion factor for the ghost propagator as for the vector one, as it will be clear below. For these purposes we choose the gauge-fixing condition in the form

$$\bar{D}^2 \frac{1}{g^2}\left(1-\mu\theta^2-\mu\bar{\theta}^2\right)V=f, \quad D^2\frac{1}{g^2}\left(1-\mu\theta^2-\mu\bar{\theta}^2\right)V=\bar{f}.$$

or

$$\bar{D}^2\frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}V=f, \quad D^2\frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}V=\bar{f}. \tag{7}$$

where we have introduced the notation

$$\tilde{g}^2=g^2\left(1+\mu\theta^2+\mu\bar{\theta}^2+2\mu^2\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2\right). \tag{8}$$

Note that due to the grassmannian origin of θ

$$\left(1-\mu\theta^2-\mu\bar{\theta}^2\right)\left(1+\mu\theta^2+\mu\bar{\theta}^2+2\mu^2\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2\right)=1.$$

Now the gauge-fixing term can be written in the standard form

$$\mathcal{L}_{gauge-fixing} \;=\; -\int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\mathrm{Tr}\,\frac{1}{\xi}\bar{f}f, \tag{9}$$

where ξ might be a real constant superfield. In what follows we take

$$\xi=\frac{\alpha}{\tilde{g}^2},$$

which leads to the following quadratic part of the action in a softly broken theory

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(2)}_{soft} \;=\; & \int d^4x d^2\theta\, d^2\bar{\theta}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\frac{1}{4g^2}\left(1-2\mu\theta^2\right)D^\alpha V\bar{D}^2D_\alpha V\right. \\ & \left. +\frac{1}{4g^2}\left(1-2\mu\bar{\theta}^2\right)\bar{D}^{\dot\alpha}VD^2\bar{D}_{\dot\alpha}V+\frac{\tilde{g}^2}{2\alpha}\left(\bar{D}^2\frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}V\right)\left(D^2\frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}V\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

One now has to find the inverse operator. It can be done analogously to the rigid case by introducing the projection operators. One should take into account, however, that while integrating the covariant derivatives by part they may also act on the spurion field. Strictly speaking, this leads to additional terms in the propagator which are, however, suppressed by powers of momenta and are inessential in the analysis of UV divergences. To understand it better, one can treat the spurion terms in eq.(10) as interactions, and to find the propagator, one has to take into account an infinite chain of this kind of insertions adding up into a geometrical progression. It can be done by the method of Ref. [5]. If in due course of this procedure some of the covariant derivatives act on a spurion field, one does not get enough powers of momenta to cancel the denominator and the resulting terms are thus suppressed for a high momentum square. Thus, as it has been also noted in Ref. [6], for the calculation of the divergent parts of the Green functions it is sufficient to take the part of the vector propagator where the chiral derivatives do not act on spurions.

Having this in mind, one can proceed in full analogy with the rigid theory, replacing the coupling g^2 by $\tilde{g}^2$, and get

$$\left\langle V^a(z_1)V^b(z_2)\right\rangle_{soft} = \frac{\tilde{g}^2}{4}\frac{\Pi_{1/2}+\alpha\Pi_0}{\partial^2}\delta^{(8)}(z_1-z_2)\delta^{ab} + \text{irrelevant terms},$$

where by irrelevant terms we mean the ones decreasing faster than $1/p^2$ for large p^2. Thus, we get a simple relation between the vector propagators of soft and rigid theories:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\langle V(x_1,\theta_1,\bar{\theta_1})V(x_2,\theta_2,\bar{\theta_2})\right\rangle_{soft} = \\ &= \frac{\tilde{g}^2}{g^2}\left\langle V(x_1,\theta_1,\bar{\theta_1})V(x_2,\theta_2,\bar{\theta_2})\right\rangle_{rigid} + \text{irrelevant terms},\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Notice that contrary to ref. [6] this relation is valid for any choice of α.

The change of the gauge fixing condition leads to the change of the ghost Lagrangian (6). It becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{ghost} &= \int d^2\theta \ \mathrm{Tr}\ b\bar{D}^2\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}\left(H(V)c+\bar{H}(V)\bar{c}\right)\right) \\ &\qquad + \int d^2\bar{\theta}\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \bar{b}D^2\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}\left(H(V)c+\bar{H}(V)\bar{c}\right)\right) \\ &= \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\ \mathrm{Tr}\ \frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2}\left(b+\bar{b}\right)\left(-\frac{V}{2}\bigwedge\left[(c+\bar{c})+\coth\left(\frac{V}{2}\right)\bigwedge(c-\bar{c})\right]\right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

As one can see from eq. (12), the situation with the ghost propagator and the vertices that contain ghost superfields is more simple. This is due to the absence of chiral derivatives in the ghost-vector interaction. Nevertheless, when calculating the inverse operator one has to repeat the same procedure with the covariant derivatives arising from the source terms. In complete analogy with the case of the vector propagator the essential part of the ghost propagator is obtained by assuming that the covariant derivatives do not act on the spurion field. The other terms are suppressed by the powers of momenta. Hence, one again has

$$\left\langle G(z_1)\bar{G}(z_2)\right\rangle_{soft} = \left(\tilde{g}^2/g^2\right)\left\langle G(z_1)\bar{G}(z_2)\right\rangle_{rigid} + \ \text{irrelevant terms}, \tag{13}$$

where G stands for any ghost superfield.

Thus, to perform the analysis of the divergent part of the diagrams in a soft theory, one has to use the same propagators as in a rigid theory multiplied by the factor $\tilde{g}^2/g^2$. It is also obviously true for any vertex of the ghost-vector interactions of the softly broken theory (12). Each vertex of this type has to be multiplied by the inverse factor $g^2/\tilde{g}^2$.

The situation is less obvious with the vector vertices. Here, one has two terms as in eq.(2) which differ only in the order of covariant derivatives, one being complex conjugated to the other. Performing grassmannian algebra in any diagram, one can always replace one term by the other; so actually one has only one term. This is what we have in a rigid theory. In a soft theory the situation is similar but the first term is multiplied by a factor $(1-2\mu\theta^2)$, while the second by the complex conjugated one $\left(1-2\mu\bar{\theta}^2\right)$. Hence, one can consider the vector vertices of only one type, as in a rigid theory, multiplied by a factor $\left(1-\mu\theta^2-\mu\bar{\theta}^2\right)$, i.e. by $g^2/\tilde{g}^2$ as in the case of the ghost-vector vertices.

Thus, we see that any element of the Feynman rules for a softly broken theory coincides with the corresponding element of a rigid theory multiplied by a common factor which is a polynomial in the grassmann coordinates.

2.2 The ultraviolet counterterms

Consider now the Green functions of a softly broken theory constructed with the help of the Feynman rules derived in the previous section. Due to the presence of a factor $g^2/\tilde{g}^2$ in the vertices and of the inverse one in the propagators, any Feynman diagram in a broken theory is given by that of a rigid theory with the spurion factors on the lines and vertices. Our aim is to show that these polynomials in grassmann variables can freely flow through the diagram and are finally collected in front of a diagram as a common factor.

Indeed, consider the corresponding grassmannian integration. The usual procedure of evaluation of grassmannian integrals in a rigid theory is the following:

i) If there are no chiral derivatives D_α or $\bar{D}_\alpha$ on the line, it is proportional to the δ-function and can be shrunk to a point.

ii) If there is some number of derivatives, one can remove them from a line integrating by parts.

iii) Repeating this procedure several times and using the properties of chiral derivatives

$$\{D_\alpha, D_\beta\} = \{\bar{D}_\alpha, \bar{D}_\beta\} = 0, \qquad D_\alpha D_\beta = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} D^2, \qquad D^2\bar{D}^2D^2 = 16p^2D^2, \quad \text{etc.}$$

to reduce their number, one can finally come to a final integration where all the chiral derivatives are concentrated on one line. The powers of momenta which appear in due course of this procedure cancel some propagator lines so that the resulting diagram diverges.

iv) The final integration is performed with the help of the relation

$$\delta_{12}\bar{D}^2D^2\delta_{12} = 16\delta_{12}. \tag{14}$$

Consider what happens if one adds grassmannian polynomials on the lines and vertices. Suppose first that all chiral derivatives inside a graph are contracted and integrated inside the graph so that there are no external derivatives left. If one of these internal derivatives acts on a spurion field it creates additional θ^α instead of D^α. Then either this θ^α survives till the last integration, or some other D_α acts on it. Thus, at the last step of integration one has instead of (14) either

$$\delta_{12}\theta_2^\alpha \bar{D}_1^2 D_1^\alpha \delta_{12} \quad \text{or} \quad \delta_{12}\bar{D}_1^2\delta_{12}.$$

It is easy to see that both the expressions are zero. Thus, the configuration when the chiral derivative acts on a spurion field gives no contribution. This means that the spurion field flows through the diagram freely and can be factorized.

Consider now the case when a graph contains some derivatives that act on external lines when performing the grassmannian integration. This case corresponds to vector interactions.

Let some covariant derivative, which originally was inside the diagram, pass through the diagram during the above mentioned procedure and act on the external vector line. We can trace this derivative in the diagram of the soft theory. On its way through the diagram it can meet some "spurion" factor in a vertex or a propagator. Integrating by parts one has two terms. The first one, when the chiral derivative acts on a spurion, and the second one, when it acts on the neighbouring propagator. When the covariant derivative does not act on a spurion it goes through the diagram like in a rigid theory and acts on external line. As a result one gets the expression $\tilde{g}^2\,(D_\alpha V^m)$. In the other case, when the covariant derivative acts on the spurion, the number of covariant derivatives is reduced compared to the rigid theory. Then, either one does not have enough of them to cancel the powers of momenta in the denominator or to get the non-zero answer or one has the same diagram as in the rigid case, but with the factor $D\tilde{g}^2$, that goes outside the diagram. Independently of the position of this factor inside the diagram, the final expression one gets after the calculation of the diagram contains $(D_\alpha\tilde{g}^2)\,V^m$ which together with the usual contribution, gives $D_\alpha\,(\tilde{g}^2V^m)$ instead of $g^2 D_\alpha V^m$ in the rigid case.

All together these factors $\tilde{g}^2$, which are met by the chiral derivative on its way to the external line of the diagram, are collected in a monom $R(\tilde{g}^2)$. Therefore, the final expression for the diagram contains $D_\alpha\,(R(\tilde{g}^2)V^m)$. The same conclusion is true for all four derivatives of the divergent vector diagram that act on the external lines. Thus, the counterterm to this diagram of the soft theory is

$$R_1(\tilde{g}^2)V^m D^\alpha\left(R_2(\tilde{g}^2)V^n\right)\bar{D}^2\left(R_3(\tilde{g}^2)V^k D_\alpha R_4(\tilde{g}^2)V^l\right), \tag{15}$$

where R_1, R_2, R_3 and R_4 are some monoms in $\tilde{g}^2$. This expression should be compared with the counterterm for the corresponding diagram of the rigid theory

$$R(g^2)V^m D^\alpha V^n \bar{D}^2 V^k D_\alpha V^l,$$

where

$$R_1(g^2)R_2(g^2)R_3(g^2)R_4(g^2) = R(g^2).$$

The momentum integral for the diagram in a soft theory is identical to that in a rigid one since the algebraic operations with the covariant derivatives coincide for the both cases.

We now want to argue that the monoms $R_i(\tilde{g}^2)$ can stand anywhere in eq.(15), i.e. that the spurions can flow through the diagram. Indeed, in a rigid theory the counterterms are absorbed into the redefinition of the field V and the coupling g^2

$$\begin{aligned} V_B &= Z_V^{1/2}(g^2)V, \\ g_B^2 &= Z_g(g^2)g^2 \end{aligned}$$

In a soft theory R_i are the functions of the external spurion superfield and the renormalization constants become these functions too. Collecting all counterterms of the type (15), one should get an expression which being written in terms of the bare quantities obeys the gauge invariance, namely

$$\mathrm{Tr}\ R_1'(\tilde{g}^2)e^{-V_B}D^\alpha R_2'(\tilde{g}^2)e^{V_B}\bar{D}^2\left(R_3'(\tilde{g}^2)e^{-V_B}D_\alpha R_4'(\tilde{g}^2)e^{V_B}\right), \tag{16}$$

where the primed monoms mean that partly they are absorbed into the renormalization of the field V_B.

Now it is clear that the covariant derivatives in eq.(16) do not act on monoms $R_i(\tilde{g}^2)$. Indeed, if one of the covariant derivatives D_α in eq.(16) acts on the momons R_2' or R_4', the two exponents cancel each other and one is left with Tr W^α that is equal to zero. In the case when the both chiral derivatives in eq. (16) act on R_2' and R_4' in both cases the exponents cancel and one has a divergent constant that should be absorbed into the renormalization of the vacuum density.

Hence, one can take the monoms R_2' and R_4' out of the covariant derivatives D_α. The other derivative, $\bar{D}^2$, does not act on the monom for the reason that $e^{-\tilde{V}_B}D^\alpha e^{\tilde{V}_B}\bar{\theta}^2 = 0$ so that in the bracket in eq.(16) only the chiral spurion $\eta = \theta^2$ survives and $\bar{D}^2$ does not act on it.

Thus, we come to a conclusion that the monoms can be factorised in front of the expression in eq.(16) just like in the rigid theory and the only difference between the rigid and softly broken theories is that the coupling constant g^2 should be replaced by $\tilde{g}^2$, i.e.

$$\tilde{Z}_i = Z_i\left(g^2 \to \tilde{g}^2\right),$$

3 Softly Broken SUSY Gauge Theory with Chiral Matter

Consider now a rigid SUSY gauge theory with chiral matter. The Lagrangian written in terms of superfields looks like

$$\mathcal{L}_{rigid} = \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\ \ \bar{\Phi}^i(e^V)_i^j\Phi_j + \int d^2\theta\ \ \mathcal{W} + \int d^2\bar{\theta}\ \ \bar{\mathcal{W}}, \tag{17}$$

where the superpotential $\mathcal{W}$ in a general form is[4]

$$\mathcal{W} = \frac{1}{6}\lambda^{ijk}\Phi_i\Phi_j\Phi_k + \frac{1}{2}M^{ij}\Phi_i\Phi_j. \tag{18}$$

The SUSY breaking terms which satisfy the requirement of "softness" can be written as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{soft-breaking} = \left[\frac{1}{6}A^{ijk}\phi_i\phi_j\phi_k + \frac{1}{2}B^{ij}\phi_i\phi_j + h.c.\right] + (m^2)^i_j\phi^*_i\phi^j, \tag{19}$$

Like in the case of a pure gauge theory the soft terms (19) can be written down in terms of superfields by using the external spurion field. Thus, the full Lagrangian for the softly broken theory can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{soft} &= \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\ \ \bar{\Phi}^i(\delta^k_i - (m^2)^k_i\eta\bar{\eta})(e^V)^j_k\Phi_j \\ &+ \int d^2\theta \left[\frac{1}{6}(\lambda^{ijk} - A^{ijk}\eta)\Phi_i\Phi_j\Phi_k + \frac{1}{2}(M^{ij} - B^{ij}\eta)\Phi_i\Phi_j\right] + h.c. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

3.1 The Feynman rules

The Lagrangian (20) allows one to write down the Feynman rules for the matter field propagators and vertices in a soft theory. We start with the propagator of the chiral field. For the purpose of the analysis of divergences one can ignore the mass terms M^{ij} and B^{ij}, since in the minimal scheme they do not contribute to the UV divergences. Then, the quadratic part looks like

$$\mathcal{L}^{(2)}_{soft} = \int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}\ \ \bar{\Phi}^i(\delta^j_i - (m^2)^j_i\eta\bar{\eta})\Phi_j.$$

The inverse operator is easy to obtain due to the nilpotent character of the spurion fields. One easily gets

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle\Phi(z_1)_i\bar{\Phi}(z_2)^j\right\rangle_{soft} &= (\delta^k_i + \frac{1}{2}(m^2)^k_i\eta\bar{\eta})\left\langle\Phi(z_1)_k\bar{\Phi}(z_2)^l\right\rangle_{rigid}(\delta^j_l + \frac{1}{2}(m^2)^j_l\eta\bar{\eta}) \\ &+\ \text{irrelevant terms}, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

where the irrelevant terms again arise from covariant derivatives acting on spurions and are suppressed by powers of momenta.

The vector-matter vertices, according to eq.(20), gain the factor $(\delta^j_i - (m^2)^j_i\eta\bar{\eta})$ so that if in a diagram one has an equal number of chiral propagators and vector-matter vertices the spurion factors cancel.

The chiral vertices of a soft theory, as it follows from eq.(20), are the same as in a rigid theory with the Yukawa couplings being replaced by

$$\lambda^{ijk} \to \lambda^{ijk} - A^{ijk}\eta, \quad \bar{\lambda}_{ijk} \to \bar{\lambda}_{ijk} - \bar{A}_{ijk}\bar{\eta}.$$

---

[4] To avoid further complications (see, e.g. [6]) we do not introduce linear terms in eqs.(18,19). This corresponds to the case when none of the fields goes into vacuum. In the absence of singlets this is guaranteed by the gauge invariance imposing some restrictions on the couplings.

3.2 The ultraviolet counterterms

The structure of the UV counterterms in chiral vertices is similar to that of the vector vertices, but is simpler due to the absence of the covariant derivatives on external lines. This corresponds to the first case considered in the previous section. To get the UV divergent diagram, the covariant derivatives should not act on spurion fields, which means that spurions factorize. In the diagrams, when the chiral vertices are contracted with the chiral propagators, this results in the following effective change of the Yukawa couplings of a softly broken theory

$$\lambda^{ijk} \;\to\; \tilde{\lambda}^{ijk} = \lambda^{ijk} - A^{ijk}\eta + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^{njk}(m^2)^i_n + \lambda^{ink}(m^2)^j_n + \lambda^{ijn}(m^2)^k_n)\eta\bar{\eta}, \qquad (22)$$

$$\bar{\lambda}_{ijk} \;\to\; \tilde{\bar{\lambda}}_{ijk} = \bar{\lambda}_{ijk} - \bar{A}_{ijk}\bar{\eta} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{njk}(m^2)^n_i + \lambda_{ink}(m^2)^n_j + \lambda_{ijn}(m^2)^n_k)\eta\bar{\eta}. \qquad (23)$$

Thus, the UV counterterms of a softly broken theory are obtained from those of a rigid one by the substitution

$$g^2 \to \tilde{g}^2, \quad \lambda^{ijk} \to \tilde{\lambda}^{ijk}, \quad \lambda_{ijk} \to \tilde{\lambda}_{ijk}.$$

4 Renormalization of Soft versus Rigid Theory: the General Case

The external field construction described above allows one to write down the renormalization of soft terms starting from the known renormalization of a rigid theory without any new diagram calculation. The following statement is valid:

The Statement *Let a rigid theory (1,18) be renormalized via introduction of the renormalization constants Z_i, defined within some minimal subtraction massless scheme. Then, a softly broken theory (2,20) is renormalized via introduction of the renormalization superfields $\tilde{Z}_i$ which are related to Z_i by the coupling constants redefinition*

$$\tilde{Z}_i(g, \lambda, \bar{\lambda}, \ldots) = Z_i(\tilde{g}^2, \tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\bar{\lambda}}, \ldots), \qquad (24)$$

where the redefined couplings are

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{g}^2 &= g^2(1 + \mu\eta + \bar{\mu}\bar{\eta} + 2\mu\bar{\mu}\eta\bar{\eta}), \quad \eta = \theta^2, \quad \bar{\eta} = \bar{\theta}^2, & (25)\\ \tilde{\lambda}^{ijk} &= \lambda^{ijk} - A^{ijk}\eta + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^{njk}(m^2)^i_n + \lambda^{ink}(m^2)^j_n + \lambda^{ijn}(m^2)^k_n)\eta\bar{\eta}, & (26)\\ \tilde{\bar{\lambda}}_{ijk} &= \bar{\lambda}_{ijk} - \bar{A}_{ijk}\bar{\eta} + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{njk}(m^2)^n_i + \lambda_{ink}(m^2)^n_j + \lambda_{ijn}(m^2)^n_k)\eta\bar{\eta}. & (27) \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to find explicit relations between the renormalizations of soft and rigid couplings which is an explicit realization on the level of final expressions of the rules A and B of ref.[6].

The renormalization constants for vector superfields and gauge couplings are general superfields, i.e. they depend on η and $\bar{\eta}$, while those for the chiral matter and ghost fields and the parameters of a superpotential are chiral superfields, i.e. they depend either on η or $\bar{\eta}$.

From eqs.(24) and (25-27) it is possible to write down an explicit differential operator which has to be applied to the β functions of a rigid theory in order to get those for the soft terms. We first construct this operator in a general case and compare the resulting expressions with explicit calculations made up to two loops. Then, using the formulated algorithm we calculate some three-loop soft term β functions. In the last section, we consider some particular models.

To simplify the formulas hereafter we use the following notation:

$$\alpha_i = g_i^2/16\pi^2, \quad y^{ijk} = \lambda^{ijk}/4\pi, \quad A^{ijk} = A^{ijk}/4\pi.$$

4.1 Pure gauge theory

Consider first the gauge couplings α_i. One has

$$\alpha_i^{Bare} = Z_{\alpha i}\alpha_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \tilde{\alpha}_i^{Bare} = \tilde{Z}_{\alpha i}\tilde{\alpha}_i, \tag{28}$$

where $Z_{\alpha i}$ is the product of the wave function and vertex renormalization constants.

Though $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ and $\tilde{Z}_{\alpha i}$ are general superfields, one has to consider only their chiral parts since the Lagrangian (1) consists of two terms, a chiral and an antichiral, and in each term only the proper chirality part contributes. Therefore, we consider the chiral part of eq.(28)

$$\alpha_i^{Bare}(1 + m_{A_i}^{Bare}\eta) = \alpha_i(1 + m_{A_i}\eta)Z_{\alpha i}(\tilde{\alpha})|_{\bar{\eta}=0}.$$

Expanding over η one has

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i^{Bare} &= \alpha_i Z_{\alpha i}(\alpha), & (29) \\ m_{A_i}^{Bare}\alpha_i^{Bare} &= m_{A_i}\alpha_i Z_{\alpha i}(\alpha) + \alpha_i D_1 Z_{\alpha i}, & (30) \end{aligned}$$

where the operator D_1 extracts the linear w.r.t. η part of $Z_{\alpha i}(\tilde{\alpha})$. Due to eqs.(25-27) the explicit form of D_1 is

$$D_1 = m_{A_i}\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} \ .$$

Combining eqs.(29) and (30) one gets

$$m_{A_i}^{Bare} = m_{A_i} + D_1 \ln Z_{\alpha i} \quad . \tag{31}$$

To find the corresponding β functions one has to differentiate eqs.(29) and (31) w.r.t. the scale factor having in mind that the operator D_1 is scale invariant. This gives

$$\beta_{\alpha i} = \alpha_i \gamma_{\alpha i}, \quad \beta_{m_{Ai}} = D_1 \gamma_{\alpha i}, \tag{32}$$

where $\gamma_{\alpha i}$ is the logarithmic derivative of $\ln Z_{\alpha i}$ equal to the anomalous dimension of the vector superfield in some particular gauges.

This result is in complete correspondence with that of Ref. [14]. Indeed, from equations (32) one can derive that the ratio $m_A\alpha/\beta_\alpha$ is renormalization group invariant.

4.2 Chiral matter

Consider now the chiral matter. Due to the non-renormalization theorems, there is no renormalization of a superpotential. This means that the only renormalization comes from the wave functions. The corresponding term in the Lagrangian including renormalizations looks like

$$\int d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \ \ \bar{\Phi}^i \tilde{Z}_i^j \Phi_j, \tag{33}$$

where the renormalization superfield $\tilde{Z}_j^i$ now has a decomposition

$$\tilde{Z}_j^i = \tilde{\bar{Z}}_{\phi k}^i \left(\delta_l^k + \Delta_l^k \eta\bar{\eta}\right) \tilde{Z}_{\phi j}^l, \tag{34}$$

where the chiral(antichiral) renormalization superfields $\tilde{Z}_{\phi j}^l(\tilde{\bar{Z}}_{\phi k}^i)$ are the wave function renormalizations and Δ_j^i is the soft term $(m^2)_j^i$ renormalization. To find, them expand $\tilde{Z}_j^i(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{\bar{y}})$ over the grassmann variables

$$\tilde{Z}_j^i = Z_j^i + D_1 Z_j^i \eta + \bar{D}_1 Z_j^i \bar{\eta} + D_2 Z_j^i \eta\bar{\eta}, \tag{35}$$

where the operator D_1 now has to take into account the η dependence of the Yukawa coupling y^{ijk}, $\bar{D}_1$ is conjugated to D_1 and D_2 is a second order differential operator which extracts the $\eta\bar{\eta}$ dependence of $\tilde{Z}_j^i$. They have the form

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= m_{A_i}\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} - A^{ijk}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{ijk}}, \quad \bar{D}_1 = m_{A_i}\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} - A_{ijk}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{ijk}}, & (36) \\ D_2 &= \bar{D}_1 D_1 + m_{A_i}^2 \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} + \frac{1}{2}(m^2)_n^a \left(y^{nbc}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{abc}} \right. & (37) \\ & \left. + y^{bnc}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{bac}} + y^{bcn}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{bca}} + y_{abc}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{nbc}} + y_{bac}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{bnc}} + y_{bca}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{bcn}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this into eq.(34) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_{\phi j}^i &= Z_{\phi j}^i + (Z_\phi^{-1})_k^i D_1 Z_j^k \eta = Z_{\phi k}^i(\delta_j^k + (Z^{-1})_l^k D_1 Z_j^l \eta), & (38) \\ \tilde{\bar{Z}}_{\phi j}^i &= Z_{\phi j}^i + \bar{D}_1 Z_k^i (Z_\phi^{-1})_j^k \bar{\eta} = (\delta_l^i + \bar{D}_1 Z_l^i (Z^{-1})_l^l \bar{\eta}) Z_{\phi j}^l, & (39) \\ \Delta_j^i &= (Z_\phi^{-1})_k^i D_2 Z_l^k (Z_\phi^{-1})_j^l - (Z_\phi^{-1})_k^i \bar{D}_1 Z_l^k (Z^{-1})_n^l D_1 Z_m^n (Z_\phi^{-1})_j^m, & (40) \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_{\phi j}^i$ satisfies

$$Z_{\phi k}^i Z_{\phi j}^k = Z_j^i$$

and is the square root of Z_j^i in the perturbative sense. The inverse one is

$$(\tilde{Z}_\phi^{-1})_j^i = (\delta_k^i - (Z^{-1})_l^i D_1 Z_k^l \eta)(Z_\phi^{-1})_j^k. \tag{41}$$

We can now write down the relations between the renormalized and the bare couplings of a superpotential. One has

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{M}_{Bare})^{ij} &= \tilde{M}^{kl} (\tilde{Z}_\phi^{-1})_k^i (\tilde{Z}_\phi^{-1})_l^j, & (42) \\ (\tilde{y}_{Bare})^{ijk} &= \tilde{y}^{lmn} (\tilde{Z}_\phi^{-1})_l^i (\tilde{Z}_\phi^{-1})_m^j (\tilde{Z}_\phi^{-1})_n^k & (43) \end{aligned}$$

or

$$M^{ij}_{Bare} - B^{ij}_{Bare}\eta = (M^{kl} - B^{kl}\eta)(\delta^i_n - (Z^{-1})^i_m D_1 Z^m_n \eta)(Z^{-1}_\phi)^n_k(\delta^j_p - (Z^{-1})^j_s D_1 Z^s_p \eta)(Z^{-1}_\phi)^p_l.$$

and analogous for y^{ijk}. Expanding over η one has for M^{ij} and B^{ij}

$$\begin{aligned}
M^{ij}_{Bare} &= M^{kl}(Z^{-1}_\phi)^i_k(Z^{-1}_\phi)^j_l, \\
B^{ij}_{Bare} &= B^{kl}(Z^{-1}_\phi)^i_k(Z^{-1}_\phi)^j_l \\
&\quad + M^{kl}(Z^{-1}_\phi)^i_k(Z^{-1})^j_p D_1 Z^p_m (Z^{-1}_\phi)^m_l + M^{kl}(Z^{-1})^i_m D_1 Z^m_n (Z^{-1}_\phi)^n_k (Z^{-1}_\phi)^j_l.
\end{aligned}$$

The last line can also be rewritten as

$$B^{ij}_{Bare} = B^{kl}(Z^{-1}_\phi)^i_k(Z^{-1}_\phi)^j_l + M^{il}_{Bare}(Z^{-1}D_1 Z)^j_l + M^{li}_{Bare}(Z^{-1}D_1 Z)^i_l \tag{44}$$

Differentiating with respect to a scale factor one gets after some algebra

$$\beta^{ij}_M = \frac{1}{2}(M^{il}\gamma^j_l + M^{lj}\gamma^i_l), \tag{45}$$

$$\beta^{ij}_B = \frac{1}{2}(B^{il}\gamma^j_l + B^{lj}\gamma^i_l) - (M^{il}D_1\gamma^j_l + M^{lj}D_1\gamma^i_l), \tag{46}$$

where γ^i_j is the anomalous dimension of the matter chiral field being the logarithmic derivative of $\ln(Z^{-1})^i_j$.

Analogously, for the Yukawa coupling y^{ijk} and for the soft triple coupling A^{ijk} we obtain

$$\beta^{ijk}_y = \frac{1}{2}(y^{ijl}\gamma^k_l + y^{ilk}\gamma^j_l + y^{ljk}\gamma^i_l), \tag{47}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{ijk}_A &= \frac{1}{2}(A^{ijl}\gamma^k_l + A^{ilk}\gamma^j_l + A^{ljk}\gamma^i_l) \\
&\quad -(y^{ijl}D_1\gamma^k_l + y^{ilk}D_1\gamma^j_l + y^{ljk}D_1\gamma^i_l).
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Consider now the renormalization of the soft mass term $(m^2)^i_j$. One has

$$(m^2_{Bare})^i_j = (m^2)^i_j - \Delta^i_j \tag{49}$$

with Δ^i_j given by eq.(40). Differentiating it with respect to a scale factor and using the explicit form of the second order differential operator D_2, after some algebra one obtains a simple expression for the β function

$$(\beta_{m^2})^i_j = D_2\gamma^i_j \tag{50}$$

4.3 Summary on the soft term renormalizations

Relations between the rigid and soft terms renormalizations are summarized in the Table.

The Rigid Terms	The Soft Terms
$\beta_{\alpha_i} = \alpha_i \gamma_{\alpha_i}$ $\beta_M^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(M^{il}\gamma_l^j + M^{lj}\gamma_l^i)$ $\beta_y^{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}(y^{ijl}\gamma_l^k + y^{ilk}\gamma_l^j + y^{ljk}\gamma_l^i)$	$\beta_{m_{Ai}} = D_1 \gamma_{\alpha i}$ $\beta_B^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(B^{il}\gamma_l^j + B^{lj}\gamma_l^i) - (M^{il}D_1\gamma_l^j + M^{lj}D_1\gamma_l^i)$ $\beta_A^{ijk} = \frac{1}{2}(A^{ijl}\gamma_l^k + A^{ilk}\gamma_l^j + A^{ljk}\gamma_l^i)$ $\quad -(y^{ijl}D_1\gamma_l^k + y^{ilk}D_1\gamma_l^j + y^{ljk}D_1\gamma_l^i)$ $(\beta_{m^2})_j^i = D_2 \gamma_j^i$
$D_1 = m_{A_i}\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} - A^{ijk}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{ijk}}$, $\qquad \bar{D}_1 = m_{A_i}\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} - A_{ijk}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{ijk}}$ $D_2 = \bar{D}_1 D_1 + m_{A_i}^2 \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i}$ $\quad +\frac{1}{2}(m^2)_n^a \left(y^{nbc}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{abc}} + y^{bnc}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{bac}} + y^{bcn}\frac{\partial}{\partial y^{bca}} + y_{abc}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{nbc}} + y_{bac}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{bnc}} + y_{bca}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{bcn}} \right)$	

Table 1: Relations between the rigid and soft term renormalizations in a massless minimal subtraction scheme

5 Illustration

To make the above formulae more clear and to demonstrate how they work in practice, we consider the renormalization group functions in a general theory up to two loops. We follow the notation of ref. [8] except that our β functions are half of those of ref. [8]. Note that all the calculations in ref. [8] are performed in the framework of dimensional reduction and the $\overline{MS}$ scheme.

The gauge β functions and the anomalous dimensions of matter superfields in a massless scheme are the functions of dimensionless gauge and Yukawa couplings of a rigid theory.

5.1 One-loop renormalization

In the one-loop order, the renormalization group functions of a rigid theory are (for simplicity, we consider the case of a single gauge coupling)

$$\gamma_\alpha^{(1)} = \alpha Q, \quad Q = T(R) - 3C(G), \tag{51}$$

$$\gamma_j^{i\ (1)} = \frac{1}{2} y^{ikl} y_{jkl} - 2\alpha C(R)_j^i, \tag{52}$$

where the Casimir operators are defined by

$$T(R)\delta_{AB} = Tr(R_A R_B), \quad C(G)\delta_{AB} = f_{ACD} f_{BCD}, \quad C(R)_j^i = (R_A R_A)_j^i.$$

Using eqs.(32-50), we construct the renormalization group functions for the soft terms

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{(1)}_{m_A} &= \alpha m_A Q, & (53)\\
\beta_B^{ij\ (1)} &= \frac{1}{2}B^{il}(\frac{1}{2}y^{jkm}y_{lkm} - 2\alpha C(R)^j_l) \\
&\quad + M^{il}(\frac{1}{2}A^{jkm}y_{lkm} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^j_l) + (i \leftrightarrow j), & (54)\\
\beta_A^{ijk\ (1)} &= \frac{1}{2}A^{ijl}(\frac{1}{2}y^{kmn}y_{lmn} - 2\alpha C(R)^k_l) \\
&\quad + y^{ijl}(\frac{1}{2}A^{kmn}y_{lmn} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^k_l) \\
&\quad + (i \leftrightarrow j) + (i \leftrightarrow k), & (55)\\
[\beta_{m^2}]^{i\ (1)}_j &= \frac{1}{2}A^{ikl}A_{jkl} - 4\alpha m_A^2 C(R)^i_j \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4}y^{nkl}(m^2)^i_n y_{jkl} + \frac{1}{4}y^{ikl}(m^2)^n_j y_{nkl} + \frac{4}{4}y^{isl}(m^2)^k_s y_{jkl}. & (56)
\end{aligned}$$

One can easily see that the resulting formulae coincide with those of ref. [8] with one exception: we have ignored hereafter all the tadpole terms assuming that they all are equal to zero because of the absence of linear terms in the action (see the footnote on p.8).

5.2 Two-loop renormalization

In two loops the situation is more tricky. The rigid renormalizations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma^{(2)}_\alpha &= 2\alpha^2 C(G)Q - \frac{2\alpha}{r}C(R)^i_j(\frac{1}{2}y^{jkl}y_{ikl} - 2\alpha C(R)^j_i), \quad r = dimG = \delta_{AA}, & (57)\\
\gamma^{i\ (2)}_j &= -(y^{imp}y_{jmn} + 2\alpha C(R)^p_j\delta^i_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nkl}y_{pkl} - 2\alpha C(R)^n_p) + 2\alpha^2 Q C(R)^i_j. & (58)
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the soft renormalizations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{(2)}_{m_A} &= 4\alpha^2 m_A C(G)Q - \frac{2\alpha m_A}{r}C(R)^i_j(\frac{1}{2}y^{jkl}y_{ikl} - 2\alpha C(R)^j_i) \\
&\quad + \frac{2\alpha}{r}C(R)^i_j(\frac{1}{2}A^{jkl}y_{ikl} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^j_i), & (59)\\
\beta_B^{ij\ (2)} &= -\frac{1}{2}B^{il}(y^{jkp}y_{lkn} + 2\alpha C(R)^p_l\delta^j_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nst}y_{pst} - 2\alpha C(R)^n_p) \\
&\quad - M^{il}(A^{jkp}y_{lkn} - 2\alpha m_A C(R)^p_l\delta^j_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nst}y_{pst} - 2\alpha C(R)^n_p) \\
&\quad - M^{il}(y^{jkp}y_{lkn} + 2\alpha C(R)^p_l\delta^j_n)(\frac{1}{2}A^{nst}y_{pst} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^n_p) \\
&\quad + B^{il}\alpha^2 Q C(R)^j_l - 4M^{il}\alpha^2 Q C(R)^j_l m_A + (i \leftrightarrow j), & (60)\\
\beta_A^{ijk\ (2)} &= -\frac{1}{2}A^{ijl}(y^{kmp}y_{lmn} + 2\alpha C(R)^p_l\delta^k_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nst}y_{pst} - 2\alpha C(R)^n_p)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& +A^{ijl}\alpha^2 QC(R)^k_l - 4y^{ijl}\alpha^2 QC(R)^j_l m_A \\
& -y^{ijl}(A^{kmp}y_{lmn} - 2\alpha m_A C(R)^p_l \delta^k_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nst}y_{pst} - 2\alpha C(R)^n_p) \\
& -y^{ijl}(y^{kmp}y_{lmn} + 2\alpha C(R)^p_l \delta^k_n)(\frac{1}{2}A^{nst}y_{pst} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^n_p) \\
& +(i \leftrightarrow j) + (i \leftrightarrow k), \qquad (61)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
[\beta_{m^2}]^{i\ (2)}_j \;=\; & -(A^{ikp}A_{jkn} + \frac{1}{2}(m^2)^i_l y^{lkp}y_{jkn} + \frac{1}{2}y^{ikp}y_{lkn}(m^2)^l_j \\
& +\frac{2}{2}y^{ilp}(m^2)^s_l y_{jsn} + \frac{1}{2}y^{iks}(m^2)^p_s y_{jkn} + \frac{1}{2}y_{ikp}(m^2)^s_n y_{jks} \\
& +4\alpha m_A^2 C(R)^p_j \delta^i_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nst}y_{pst} - 2\alpha C(R)^n_p) \\
& -(y^{ikp}y_{jkn} + 2\alpha C(R)^p_j \delta^i_n)(\frac{1}{2}A^{nst}A_{pst} + \frac{1}{4}(m^2)^k_l y^{lst}y_{pst} \\
& +\frac{1}{4}y^{nst}y_{lst}(m^2)^l_p + \frac{4}{4}y^{nlt}(m^2)^s_l y_{pst} - 2\alpha m_A^2 C(R)^n_p) \\
& -(A^{ikp}y_{jkn} - 2\alpha m_A C(R)^p_j \delta^i_n)(\frac{1}{2}y^{nst}A_{pst} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^n_p) \\
& -(y^{ikp}A_{jkn} - 2\alpha m_A C(R)^p_j \delta^i_n)(\frac{1}{2}A^{nst}y_{pst} + 2\alpha m_A C(R)^n_p) \\
& +12\alpha^2 m_A^2 QC(R)^i_j \qquad (62)
\end{aligned}
$$

Comparing these formulae with those of ref. [8] we find that they coincide with one exception. The renormalization of m^2 in eq.(16) of ref. [8] has two extra terms, $8g^4SC(R)^i_j$ and the term proportional to the mass of the so-called ε-scalars, $\tilde{m}^2$. The first term, though it is not proportional to $\tilde{m}^2$, still has the same origin. It has appeared as a result of the ε-scalar mass counterterm in one loop.

The presence or absence of these terms is renormalization scheme dependent. The version of dimensional reduction adopted in ref. [8] corresponds to diagram by diagram minimal subtraction of divergences and naturally includes the ε-scalar mass counterterm. Our substitution being formulated in the superfield formalism does not contain ε-scalars; no surprise that the corresponding terms do not appear.

There are two ways to resolve the noticed discrepancy. Either to redefine the renormalization scheme in such a way that these terms are not present, like the one in Ref. [12], or to modify the superfield renormalization procedure to reproduce these terms (see also the discusson of this point in Ref. [15]).

5.3 Three-loop soft renormalizations

To demonstrate the power of the proposed algorithm, we calculate the three loop gaugino mass renormalization out of a gauge β function. One has in three loops [9]

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma^{(3)}_\alpha \;=\; & \alpha^3 C(G)Q[4C(G) - Q] - \frac{6}{r}\alpha^3 QC(R)^i_j C(R)^j_i \\
+ \; & \frac{3}{r}\alpha^2(y^{ikl}y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j)C(R)^j_s C(R)^s_i - \frac{2}{r}\alpha^2 C(G)(y^{ikl}y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j)C(R)^j_i
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \frac{3}{2r}\alpha y^{ikm} y_{jkn}(y^{nst} y_{mst} - 4\alpha C(R)^n_m) C(R)^j_i \\
&+ \frac{1}{4r}\alpha (y^{ikl} y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j)(y^{jst} y_{pst} - 4\alpha C(R)^j_p) C(R)^p_i .
\end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

The corresponding gaugino mass renormalization is

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta^{(3)}_{m_A} &= 3\alpha^3 C(G) Q[4C(G) - Q] m_A - \frac{18}{r}\alpha^3 Q C(R)^i_j C(R)^j_i m_A \\
&+ \frac{6}{r}\alpha^2 (y^{ikl} y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j) C(R)^j_s C(R)^s_i m_A \\
&- \frac{3}{r}\alpha^2 (A^{ikl} y_{jkl} + 4\alpha C(R)^i_j m_A) C(R)^j_s C(R)^s_i \\
&- \frac{4}{r}\alpha^2 C(G)(y^{ikl} y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j) C(R)^j_i m_A \\
&+ \frac{2}{r}\alpha^2 C(G)(A^{ikl} y_{jkl} + 4\alpha C(R)^i_j m_A) C(R)^j_i \\
&+ \frac{3}{2r}\alpha y^{ikm} y_{jkn}(y^{nst} y_{mst} - 4\alpha C(R)^n_m) C(R)^j_i m_A \\
&- \frac{3}{2r}\alpha A^{ikm} y_{jkn}(y^{nst} y_{mst} - 4\alpha C(R)^n_m) C(R)^j_i \\
&- \frac{3}{2r}\alpha y^{ikm} y_{jkn}(A^{nst} y_{mst} + 4\alpha C(R)^n_m m_A) C(R)^j_i \\
&+ \frac{1}{4r}\alpha (y^{ikl} y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j)(y^{jst} y_{pst} - 4\alpha C(R)^j_p) C(R)^p_i m_A \\
&- \frac{1}{4r}\alpha (A^{ikl} y_{jkl} + 4\alpha C(R)^i_j m_A)(y^{jst} y_{pst} - 4\alpha C(R)^j_p) C(R)^p_i \\
&- \frac{1}{4r}\alpha (y^{ikl} y_{jkl} - 4\alpha C(R)^i_j)(A^{jst} y_{pst} + 4\alpha C(R)^j_p m_A) C(R)^p_i .
\end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

6 Soft Renormalizations in the MSSM

The general rules described in the previous section can be applied to any model, in particular to the MSSM. In the case when the field content and the Yukawa interactions are fixed, it is more useful to deal with numerical rather than with tensor couplings. Rewriting the superpotential (18) and the soft terms (19) in terms of group invariants, one has

$$\mathcal{W}_{SUSY} = \frac{1}{6}\sum_a y_a \lambda^{ijk}_a \Phi_i \Phi_j \Phi_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_b M_b h^{ij}_b \Phi_i \Phi_j , \tag{65}$$

and

$$-\mathcal{L}_{soft} = \left[\frac{1}{6}\sum_a \mathcal{A}_a \lambda^{ijk}_a \phi_i \phi_j \phi_k + \frac{1}{2}\sum_b \mathcal{B}_b h^{ij}_b \phi_i \phi_j + \frac{1}{2} m_{A_j} \lambda_j \lambda_j + h.c.\right] + (m^2)^j_i \phi^{*i} \phi_j , \tag{66}$$

where we have introduced numerical couplings $y_a, M_b, \mathcal{A}_a$ and $\mathcal{B}_b$.

Usually, it is assumed that the soft terms obey the universality hypothesis, i.e. they repeat the structure of a superpotential, namely

$$\mathcal{A}_a = y_a A_a, \quad \mathcal{B}_b = M_b B_b, \quad (m^2)^i_j = m^2_i \delta^i_j. \tag{67}$$

Thus, we have the following set of couplings and soft parameters:

$$g_j, \ y_a, \ M_b, \ A_a, \ B_b, \ m^2_i, \ m_{A_j}.$$

Then, the renormalization group β functions of a rigid theory (32,45,47) look like (for simplicity, we assume the diagonal renormalization of matter superfields)

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\alpha_j} &= \beta_j \equiv \alpha_j \gamma_{\alpha_j}, & (68)\\ \beta_{y_a} &= \frac{1}{2} y_a \sum_i K_{ai} \gamma_i, & (69)\\ \beta_{M_b} &= \frac{1}{2} M_b \sum_i T_{bi} \gamma_i, & (70) \end{aligned}$$

where γ_i is the anomalous dimension of the superfield Φ_i, γ_{α_j} is the anomalous dimension of the gauge superfield (in some gauges) and numerical matrices K and T specify which particular fields contribute to a given term in eq.(65).

To get the renormalization of the soft terms, one has to apply the algorithm of the previous section, eqs.(32,46,48). In terms of numerical couplings it is simplified.

The renormalizations of the soft terms are expressed through those of a rigid theory in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{m_{A_j}} &= D_1 \gamma_{\alpha_j}, & (71)\\ \beta_{A_a} &= -D_1 \sum_i K_{ai} \gamma_i, & (72)\\ \beta_{B_b} &= -D_1 \sum_i T_{bi} \gamma_i, & (73)\\ \beta_{m^2_i} &= D_2 \gamma_i, & (74) \end{aligned}$$

and the operators D_1 and D_2 now take the form

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= m_{A_i} \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} - A_a Y_a \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_a}, & (75)\\ D_2 &= (m_{A_i} \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} - A_a Y_a \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_a})^2 + m^2_{A_i} \alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} + m^2_i K_{ai} Y_a \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_a}. & (76) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the notation $Y_a \equiv \frac{y_a^2}{16\pi^2}$.

6.1 Illustration

To illustrate these rules, we consider as an example one loop renormalization of the MSSM couplings. Consider for simplicity the third generation Yukawa couplings only. Then, superpotential is

$$\mathcal{W}_{MSSM} = (y_t Q^j U^c H^i_2 + y_b Q^j D'^c H^i_1 + y_\tau L^j E^c H^i_1 + \mu H^i_1 H^j_2)\epsilon_{ij}, \tag{77}$$

where Q, U, D', L and E are quark doublet, up-quark, down-quark, lepton doublet and lepton singlet superfields, respectively, and H_1 and H_2 are Higgs doublet superfields. i and j are the $SU(2)$ indices.

The soft terms have a universal form

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{soft-breaking} &= \sum_i m_i^2|\phi_i|^2 + (\frac{1}{2}\sum_a \lambda_a\lambda_a \\ &+ A_t y_t q^j u^c h_2^i + A_b y_b q^j d'^c h_1^i + A_\tau y_\tau l^j e^c h_1^i + B\mu h_1^i h_2^j + h.c.), \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where the small letters denote the scalar components of the corresponding superfields and λ_a are the gauginos. The $SU(2)$ indices are suppressed.

Renormalizations in a rigid theory in the one loop order are given by the formulae

$$\gamma^{(1)}_{\alpha_i} = b_i\alpha_i, \quad i=1,2,3, \quad b_i = \frac{33}{5}, 1, -3, \tag{79}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_Q = Y_t + Y_b - \frac{8}{3}\alpha_3 - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 - \frac{1}{30}\alpha_1, \tag{80}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_U = 2Y_t - \frac{8}{3}\alpha_3 - \frac{8}{15}\alpha_1, \tag{81}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_D = 2Y_b - \frac{8}{3}\alpha_3 - \frac{2}{15}\alpha_1, \tag{82}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_L = Y_\tau - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 - \frac{3}{10}\alpha_1, \tag{83}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_E = 2Y_\tau - \frac{6}{5}\alpha_1, \tag{84}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_{H_1} = 3Y_b + Y_\tau - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 - \frac{3}{10}\alpha_1, \tag{85}$$

$$\gamma^{(1)}_{H_2} = 3Y_t - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_2 - \frac{3}{10}\alpha_1. \tag{86}$$

Consequently, the renormalization group β functions are

$$\beta^{(1)}_{\alpha_i} = b_i\alpha_i^2, \tag{87}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{Y_t} = Y_t(6Y_t + Y_b - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_2 - \frac{13}{15}\alpha_1), \tag{88}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{Y_b} = Y_b(Y_t + 6Y_b + Y_\tau - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_2 - \frac{7}{15}\alpha_1), \tag{89}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{Y_\tau} = Y_\tau(3Y_b + 4Y_\tau - 3\alpha_2 - \frac{9}{5}\alpha_1), \tag{90}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{\mu^2} = \mu^2(3Y_t + 3Y_b + Y_\tau - 3\alpha_2 - \frac{3}{5}\alpha_1). \tag{91}$$

This allows us immediately to write down the soft term renormalizations

$$\beta^{(1)}_{A_t} = 6Y_tA_t + Y_bA_b + \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 m_{A_3} + 3\alpha_2 m_{A_2} + \frac{13}{15}\alpha_1 m_{A_1}, \tag{92}$$

$$\beta^{(1)}_{A_b} = Y_tA_t + 6Y_bA_b + Y_\tau A_\tau + \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 m_{A_3} + 3\alpha_2 m_{A_2} + \frac{7}{15}\alpha_1 m_{A_1}, \tag{93}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta^{(1)}_{A_\tau} &= 3Y_bA_b + 4Y_\tau A_\tau + 3\alpha_2 m_{A_2} + \frac{9}{5}\alpha_1 m_{A_1}, && (94)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{B} &= 3Y_tA_t + 3Y_bA_b + Y_\tau A_\tau + 3\alpha_2 m_{A_2} + \frac{3}{5}\alpha_1 m_{A_2}, && (95)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m_{A_i}} &= \alpha_i b_i m_{A_i}, && (96)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_Q} &= Y_t(m^2_Q + m^2_U + m^2_{H_2} + A^2_t) + Y_b(m^2_Q + m^2_D + m^2_{H_1} + A^2_b) && (97)\\
&\quad -\frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 m^2_{A_3} - 3\alpha_2 m^2_{A_2} - \frac{1}{15}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, &&\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_U} &= 2Y_t(m^2_Q + m^2_U + m^2_{H_2} + A^2_t) - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 m^2_{A_3} - \frac{16}{15}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, && (98)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_D} &= 2Y_b(m^2_Q + m^2_D + m^2_{H_1} + A^2_b) - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 m^2_{A_3} - \frac{4}{15}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, && (99)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_L} &= Y_\tau(m^2_L + m^2_E + m^2_{H_1} + A^2_\tau) - 3\alpha_2 m^2_{A_2} - \frac{3}{5}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, && (100)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_E} &= 2Y_\tau(m^2_L + m^2_E + m^2_{H_1} + A^2_\tau) - \frac{12}{5}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, && (101)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_{H_1}} &= 3Y_b(m^2_Q + m^2_D + m^2_{H_1} + A^2_b) + Y_\tau(m^2_L + m^2_E + m^2_{H_1} + A^2_\tau) &&\\
&\quad -3\alpha_2 m^2_{A_2} - \frac{3}{5}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, && (102)\\
\beta^{(1)}_{m^2_{H_2}} &= 3Y_t(m^2_Q + m^2_U + m^2_{H_2} + A^2_t) - 3\alpha_2 m^2_{A_2} - \frac{3}{5}\alpha_1 m^2_{A_1}, && (103)
\end{aligned}
$$

which perfectly coincide with those of ref.([13])

6.2 Two and three-loop gaugino mass renormalization

We calculate here the two and three loop gaugino mass renormalization out of a corresponding gauge β functions. The RG β functions for the gauge couplings in the MSSM are [10]

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{\alpha_i} &= b_i\alpha_i^2 + \alpha_i^2\left(\sum_j b_{ij}\alpha_j - \sum_f a_{if}Y_f\right)\\
&\quad +\alpha_i^2\left[\sum_{jk} b_{ijk}\alpha_j\alpha_k - \sum_{jf} a_{ijf}\alpha_j Y_f + \sum_{fg} a_{ifg}Y_fY_g\right] + ..., \qquad (104)
\end{aligned}
$$

where Y_f means Y_t, Y_b and Y_τ and the coefficients $b_i, b_{ij}, a_{if}, b_{ijk}, a_{ijf}$ and a_{ifg} are given in ref. [10].

For the gaugino masses we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{m_{A_i}} &= b_i\alpha_i m_{A_i} + \alpha_i\left(\sum_j b_{ij}\alpha_j(m_{A_i} + m_{A_j}) - \sum_f a_{if}Y_f(m_{A_i} - A_f)\right)\\
&\quad +\alpha_i\left[\sum_{jk} b_{ijk}\alpha_j\alpha_k(m_{A_i} + m_{A_j} + m_{A_k}) - \sum_{jf} a_{ijf}\alpha_j Y_f(m_{A_i} + m_{A_j} - A_f)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+\sum_{fg} a_{ifg}Y_fY_g(m_{A_i}-A_f-A_g)\Bigg] + ..., \tag{105}$$

The same formulae can easily be obtained for the other soft terms. We do not write them down here due to the lack of space. Instead, the explicit formulae in the case when only top Yukawa coupling and α_3 are retained are presented in Appendix.

Appendix. Three-loop renormalizations in the MSSM

In this section, we present explicit formulae for rigid and soft term renormalizations in the MSSM in the three-loop approximation in the case when we retain only α_3 and top Yukawa coupling Y_t.

The rigid renormalizations are [10]

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{\alpha_3} &= -3\alpha_3^2+\alpha_3^2(14\alpha_3-4Y_t)+\alpha_3^2[\frac{347}{3}\alpha_3^2-\frac{104}{3}\alpha_3Y_t+30Y_t^2], && (106)\\
\gamma_t &= (2Y_t-\frac{8}{3}\alpha_3)-(8Y_t^2+\frac{8}{9}\alpha_3^2)+[(30+12\zeta_3)Y_t^3 && (107)\\
&+ (\frac{16}{3}+96\zeta_3)Y_t^2\alpha_3-(\frac{64}{3}+\frac{544}{3}\zeta_3)Y_t\alpha_3^2+(\frac{2720}{27}+320\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3], &&\\
\gamma_b &= -\frac{8}{3}\alpha_3-\frac{8}{9}\alpha_3^2+[-\frac{80}{3}Y_t\alpha_3^2+(\frac{2720}{27}+320\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3], && (108)\\
\gamma_Q &= (Y_t-\frac{8}{3}\alpha_3)-(5Y_t^2+\frac{8}{9}\alpha_3^2)+[(15+6\zeta_3)Y_t^3 && (109)\\
&+ (\frac{40}{3}+48\zeta_3)Y_t^2\alpha_3-(\frac{72}{3}+\frac{272}{3}\zeta_3)Y_t\alpha_3^2+(\frac{2720}{27}+320\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3], &&\\
\gamma_{H_2} &= (3Y_t)-(9Y_t^2-16Y_t\alpha_3) && (110)\\
&+ [(57+18\zeta_3)Y_t^3+(72-144\zeta_3)Y_t^2\alpha_3-(\frac{160}{3}+16\zeta_3)Y_t\alpha_3^2], &&\\
\beta_{Y_t} &= Y_t\Big\{(6Y_t-\frac{16}{3}\alpha_3)-(22Y_t^2-16Y_t\alpha_3+\frac{16}{9}\alpha_3^2)+[(102+36\zeta_3)Y_t^3 && (111)\\
&+ \frac{272}{3}Y_t^2\alpha_3-(\frac{296}{3}+288\zeta_3)Y_t\alpha_3^2+(\frac{5440}{27}+640\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3]\Big\}, &&\\
\beta_{\mu^2} &= \mu^2\Big\{3Y_t-(9Y_t^2-16Y_t\alpha_3) && (112)\\
&+ [(57+18\zeta_3)Y_t^3+(72-144\zeta_3)Y_t^2\alpha_3-(\frac{160}{3}+16\zeta_3)Y_t\alpha_3^2]\Big\}, &&
\end{aligned}$$

The corresponding soft term renormalizations read

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{M_3} &= -3\alpha_3M_3+28\alpha_3^2M_3-4Y_t\alpha_3(M_3-A_t) && (113)\\
&+ 347\alpha_3^3M_3-\frac{104}{3}\alpha_3^2Y_t(2M_3-A_t)+30\alpha_3Y_t^2(M_3-2A_t), &&\\
\beta_{A_t} &= (6Y_tA_t+\frac{16}{3}\alpha_3M_3)-[44Y_t^2A_t-16Y_t\alpha_3(A_t-M_3)-\frac{32}{9}\alpha_3^2M_3] && (114)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ && [(306+108\zeta_3)Y_t^3 A_t + \frac{272}{3} Y_t^2 \alpha_3 (2A_t - M_3) \\
&- && (\frac{296}{3} + 288\zeta_3) Y_t \alpha_3^2 (A_t - 2M_3) - 3(\frac{5440}{27} + 640\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3 M_3],
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_B &= && 3Y_t A_t - [18Y_t^2 A_t - 16 Y_t \alpha_3 (A_t - M_3)] \\
&+ && [(171+54\zeta_3)Y_t^3 A_t + (72-144\zeta_3) Y_t^2 \alpha_3 (2A_t - M_3) \\
&- && (\frac{160}{3} + 16\zeta_3) Y_t \alpha_3^2 (A_t - 2M_3)],
\end{aligned}
\tag{115}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{m_t^2} &= && 2Y_t(m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + A_t^2) - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 M_3^2 - 16 Y_t^2 (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 2A_t^2) \\
&- && \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3^2 M_3^2 + 3(30+12\zeta_3) Y_t^3 (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 3A_t^2) \\
&+ && (\frac{16}{3} + 96\zeta_3) Y_t^2 \alpha_3 [(2A_t - M_3)^2 + 2(m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + M_3^2] \\
&- && (\frac{64}{3} + \frac{544}{3}\zeta_3) Y_t \alpha_3^2 [(A_t - 2M_3)^2 + (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + 2M_3^2] \\
&+ && 12(\frac{2720}{27} + 320\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3 M_3^2,
\end{aligned}
\tag{116}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{m_b^2} &= && -\frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 M_3^2 - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3^2 M_3^2 \\
&- && \frac{80}{3} Y_t \alpha_3^2 [(A_t - 2M_3)^2 + (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + 2M_3^2] \\
&+ && 12(\frac{2720}{27} + 320\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3 M_3^2,
\end{aligned}
\tag{117}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{m_Q^2} &= && Y_t(m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + A_t^2) - \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3 M_3^2 - 10 Y_t^2 (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 2A_t^2) \\
&- && \frac{16}{3}\alpha_3^2 M_3^2 + 3(15+6\zeta_3) Y_t^3 (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 3A_t^2) \\
&+ && (\frac{40}{3} + 48\zeta_3) Y_t^2 \alpha_3 [(2A_t - M_3)^2 + 2(m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + M_3^2] \\
&- && (\frac{72}{3} + \frac{272}{3}\zeta_3) Y_t \alpha_3^2 [(A_t - 2M_3)^2 + (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + 2M_3^2] \\
&+ && 12(\frac{2720}{27} + 320\zeta_3)\alpha_3^3 M_3^2,
\end{aligned}
\tag{118}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\beta_{m_{H_2}^2} &= && 3Y_t(m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + A_t^2) - 18 Y_t^2 (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 2A_t^2) \\
&+ && 16 Y_t \alpha_3 [(A_t - M_3)^2 + (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + M_3^2] \\
&+ && 3(57+18\zeta_3) Y_t^3 (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2 + 3A_t^2) \\
&+ && (72 - 144\zeta_3) Y_t^2 \alpha_3 [(2A_t - M_3)^2 + 2(m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + M_3^2] \\
&- && (\frac{160}{3} + 16\zeta_3) Y_t \alpha_3^2 [(A_t - 2M_3)^2 + (m_t^2 + m_Q^2 + m_{H_2}^2) + 2M_3^2],
\end{aligned}
\tag{119}
$$

where $M_3 \equiv m_{A_3}$.

Acknowledgements

D.K. is grateful to D.Maison and K.Chetyrkin for valuable discussions. Financial support from RFBR grant # 96-02-17379a and RFBR-DFG grant # 00082G and DFG grant # 436 RUS 113/335/O(R) is kindly acknowledged. D.K. and I.K. would like to express their gratitude to the University of Karlsruhe where part of this work has been done.

Note added

When this paper has already been finished we became aware of the paper [16], where similar results were obtained. Our results coincide with their ones in many points. Except for the relation between the gauge coupling $\beta-$function and the gaugino $\beta-$function, the authors of Ref. [16] have deduced the same relations between the renormalization group functions of the soft and rigid theories through the differential operators D_1 and D_2 starting from the Yamada's rules [6]. As for the β_α–β_{m_A} relation, their starting point was the Hisano–Shifman formula [14]. Our approach is based on a consideration of the soft theory as a rigid one embedded into the external $x-$independent superfields, that are the charges and masses of the theory. The Yamada's rules together with the operator constructions D_1 and D_2 are just the technical consequences of this approach.

References

[1] L. Girardello and M.T. Grisaru, Nucl. Phys. **B194** (1982) 65.

[2] R. Delbourgo, Nuovo Cim. **25A** (1975) 646;
A. Salam and J. Strathdee, Nucl. Phys. **B86** (1975) 142;
K. Fujikawa and W. Lang, ibid. Nucl. Phys. **B88** (1975) 61.

[3] M.T. Grisaru, M. Roček and W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. **B59** (1979) 429.

[4] J.A. Helayël-Neto, Phys. Lett. **135B** (1984) 78;
F. Feruglio, J.A. Helayël-Neto and F. Legovini, Nucl. Phys. **B249** (1985) 533;

[5] M. Scholl, Z. Phys. **C28** (1985) 545.

[6] Y. Yamada, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 3537.

[7] M. Vaughn and S. Martin, Phys. Lett. **318B** (1993) 331, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 2282.

[8] I. Jack and D.R.T. Jones, Phys. Lett. **333B** (1994) 372.

[9] I. Jack, D.R.T. Jones and C.G. North, hep-ph/9606323, Phys. Lett. **386B** (1996) 138

[10] P.M. Ferreira, I. Jack and D.R.T. Jones, hep-ph/9605440, Phys. Lett. **387B** (1996) 80.

[11] P. West, "Introduction to Supersymmetry and Supergravity", World Scientific, 1986.

[12] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. **84B** (1979) 193;
R. van Damme and G. 't Hooft, Phys. Lett. **150B** (1985) 133.

[13] see, for example,
V. Barger, M.S. Berger and P. Ohmann, Phys. Rev. **D47** (1993) 1093;
W. Boer, R. Ehret and D.I. Kazakov, Z. Phys. **C67** (1995) 667;

[14] J. Hisano and M.A. Shifman, hep-ph/9705417.

[15] I. Jack, D.R.T. Jones, S. Martin, M. Vaughn and Y. Yamada, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 5481.

[16] I. Jack and D.R.T. Jones, hep-ph/9709364.